



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/813,639	03/21/2001	Frank van Diggelen	GLBL/006	2896
7590	06/07/2004		EXAMINER	
THOMASON, MOSER & PATTERSON, LLP SUITE 100 595 SHERWSBURY AVENUE SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702			ZEWDU, MELESS NMN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2683	7
DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/813,639	DIGGELEN, FRANK VAN
	Examiner Meless N Zewdu	Art Unit 2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-20 and 22-44 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-20 and 22-44 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on 3/15/04.
2. Claims 6 and 21 have been canceled in this amendment.
3. Claims 1-5, 7-20 and 22-44 are pending in this action.
4. This action is final.

Claim Objections

Claims 22-24 are objected to because of the following informalities: The cited claims remained depended on the canceled claim 21. For examination purpose, examiner considers claims 22-24 depend on claim 17. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13, 17-20, 25, 27 and 31-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Yehezkel et al. (Yehezkel) (US 6,049,711) in view of Holland (US 6,321,091 B1).

In regard to Claims 1, 17 and 31, Ben-Yehezkel discloses a method and apparatus for providing location-based information for a wireless device, the method comprising: receiving a message from said wireless device via a wireless network; determining whether the received message contains a request for location-based information; determining the location of said wireless device using said wireless network if the received message is determined to contain the request; retrieving location-based information related to the determined location; and transmitting the location-based information to said wireless device via said wireless network (Abstract)(Figs. 1&3)(C2, L.43-67)(C3, L.1-5, L.24-26)(C7, L.13-67)(C8, L.1-30). But, Yehezkel does not explicitly teach that the received message from the wireless device is an electronic message mail associated with a predefined address, as claimed by applicant. Here, few explanations are in order. First, an email uniquely defines an address in a manner a telephone number does. In other words, an address that has been assigned an email is pre-defined. Second, Yehezkel discloses "method and apparatus for providing location-based information services" to a mobile data terminal, connected directly to TELETRAC transceiver or by suing PDA or a portable computer with a wireless interface device to access other networks, upon request (see for e.g. col. 6, lines 53-67). In other words, Yehezkel provides a computer with a wireless interface device --- a mobile data terminal. In the final analysis, the difference between the claims and the Yehezkel's reference is the lack of explicit showing that the location request message is an email message. However, in a related field of endeavor, Holland teaches that a subscriber user of a subscriber computer can request position data information by accessing a web browser software and contacting the web server software residing in a remote location wherein the the subscriber computer could be a laptop or PDA (see col. 9, lines 19-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yehezkel's mobile data terminal (PDA or

portable computer) with email capability of Holland's subscriber computer (data terminal) for the advantage of accessing the larger network of the internet (see col. 4, lines 18-48

In regard to Claims 2, 19 and 32, Ben-Yehezkel further discloses the method verifying a user of the wireless device prior to retrieving location-based information to said wireless device (C8, L.30-39).

In regard to Claim 3, Ben-Yehezkel also discloses the method of verifying in which it comprises determining whether the user of said wireless device is listed in a user database (C8, L.9-24).

In regard to Claims 4 and 34, Ben-Yehezkel further discloses that said location-based information comprises a location of at least one entity within a region containing said wireless device (C7, L.63-67)(C8, L.12-14).

In regard to Claims 5 and 43, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the method of claim 4 wherein said location-based information comprises the location of at least one of gas stations, hotels, cinema, automobile repair facilities, department stores and emergency services (C7, L.67)(C8, L.1-5).

In regard to Claim 7, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the method of claim 1 wherein said determining of the received message comprises: identifying whether the received message contains a predefined character string; and determining the received message as a request for location-based information if the pre-defined character string is identified in the received message (C2, L.43-65).

In regard to Claim 8, Ben-Yehezkel discloses that the pre-defined character string is located in at least one of a header, a TO: field, a CC: field, or a body of the received message. Wherein the examiner interprets the usage of the term "information content" to be equivalent to the term of "body of the received message".

In regard to Claim 9, Ben-Yehezkel also discloses that the pre-defined character string is in one of a text format and a binary format (C5, L.51-56)(Fig. 2, item 155).

In regard to Claim 10, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the determining of the received message is automatically identified as a request for location-based information (C4, L6-9).

In regard to Claim 11, Ben-Yehezkel further discloses that determining the location comprises: obtaining the location of said wireless device as determined by a wireless communications system of said wireless network (Fig. 2, item 128)(C5, L.14-26).

In regard to Claims 13 and 27, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the method of determining the location comprises: determining the location using at least one of time of arrival information, field strength values and global positioning system information. Wherein the geocoder referenced by Ben-Yehezkel reflects the claimed global positioning system information in terms of latitude and longitude (C5, L.59-67)(C6, L.1-2).

In regard to Claims 18 and 35, Ben-Yehezkel discloses in his system that a received message is provided from at least one of a wireless network (C2, L.60-67)(C3, L.1-5). When the references are combined as shown above, the wireless network will be connected to the internet.

In regard to Claims 20 and 33, Ben-Yehezkel discloses in his method and apparatus that the location-based information comprises a map of the location of said wireless device retrieved via the CPU or the processor of the system (C5, L.57_67)(C6, L.1-28)(Fig. 2, items 150, 160 and 164).

In regard to Claim 25, Ben-Yehezkel discloses a method wherein determining the location comprises: transmitting a query signal to said wireless device, where said query signal causes said wireless device to respond with a response signal; and receiving said response signal from said wireless device, where said response signal is configured to include the location of

said wireless device (C2, L.43-67)(C3, L.1-5)(C4, L6-9) (Fig.1, items 134 and 128)(C5, L.14-26).

In regard to Claims 36 and 37, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the apparatus to configure a replay or a forward message containing location-based information retrieved from a map database and a data retrieval system (C2, L.37-65)(Fig. 2)(C10, L.11-24, L.34-41).

In regard to Claim 38, Ben-Yehezkel discloses in his system that a wireless device comprises at least one of a two-way pager, a personal digital assistant (PDA) and a cellular telephone (Fig. 1, items 118, 124).

In regard to Claim 39, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the apparatus' processor to be able to utilize a digital data interface such as the Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) interface. Wherein the examiner acknowledges the TCP/IP interface to be one of data interface (C6, L.53-67)

In regard to Claim 40, Ben-Yehezkel discloses a wireless communications system controller, coupled to said support circuit, for determining the location of said wireless device (C5, L.37-43).

In regard to Claim 41, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the apparatus to include a request message to be from a wireless device (C2, L.43-46)(C4, L.59-64)(Fig. 1, 118 or 122 or 124).

In regard to Claim 42, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the request message is sent from a message sending device to request a map containing the location of wireless device (C2, L. 43-65)(4, L.38-33).

In regard to Claim 44, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the location-base information comprises a map of an area surrounding the wireless device (C.5, L.57-67)(C6, L.1-27).

In regard to Claim 22, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the method of claim 1 wherein said determining of the received message comprises: identifying whether the received message contains a

predefined character string; and determining the received message as a request for location-based information if the pre-defined character string is identified in the received message (C2, L.43-65).

In regard to Claim 23, Ben-Yehezkel further discloses that the pre-defined character string is located in at least one of a header, a TO: field, a CC: field, or a body of the received message. Wherein the examiner interprets the usage of the term "information content" to be equivalent to the term of "body of the received message".

In regard to Claim 24, Ben-Yehezkel also discloses that the pre-defined character string is in one of a text format and a binary format (C5, L.51-56)(Fig. 2, item 155).

1. Claims 12 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Yehezkel in view of Holland, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Fattouche (Patent #5,890,068).

In regard to Claims 12 and 26 Ben-Yehezkel discloses a general method of location determination (C2, L.8-65). However, Ben-Yehezkel in view of Holland do not disclose explicitly that the method comprises of determining the location of a communications tower previously receiving a wireless signal from said wireless device. Fattouch teaches in his modified system to include measuring location by allowing a location acquisition station (or a communication tower) to receive radio signals to obtain arrival estimation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to follow Fattouche on Ben-Yehezkel in view of Holland in order to provide a better signal determination.

2. Claims 14-16 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Yehezkel in view Holland, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Kennedy (Patent #5,317,323).

In regard to Claims 14 and 28, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the method of determining the location comprises: determining the location of communications towers previously receiving a wireless signal from said wireless device (Abstract)(C2, L.43-65). However, Ben-Yehezkel in view of Holland do not specify that such calculation would be of at least two towers. Also, he does not disclose explicitly that calculating the location of said wireless device from the locations of the least two communications towers. Kennedy explicitly teaches in his system the method of location calculation utilizing at least two radios or communication towers (C3, L.15-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to follow Kennedy on Ben-Yehezkel in view of Holland in order to provide a better accuracy.

In regard to Claims 15, 16, 29 and 30, Kennedy further teaches that the calculating comprises: averaging the location of the at least two communications towers and determining the maximum likelihood. Wherein the examiner interprets the process of averaging is a form of calculation (C3, L.8-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to follow Kennedy on Ben-Yehezkel in order to provide a better location determination.

Second Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill

in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13, 17-20, 25, 27 and 31-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Yehezkel et al. (Yehezkel) (US 6,049,711) in view of Smith (US 2002/0042277 A1).

In regard to Claims 1, 17 and 31, Ben-Yehezkel discloses a method and apparatus for providing location-based information for a wireless device, the method comprising: receiving a message from said wireless device via a wireless network; determining whether the received message contains a request for location-based information; determining the location of said wireless device using said wireless network if the received message is determined to contain the request; retrieving location-based information related to the determined location; and transmitting the location-based information to said wireless device via said wireless network (Abstract)(Figs. 1&3)(C2, L.43-67)(C3, L.1-5, L.24-26)(C7, L.13-67)(C8, L.1-30). But, Yehezkel does not explicitly teach that the received message from the wireless device is an electronic message mail associated with a predefined address, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Smith teaches that a subscriber can access a subscriber information service center (SISC) in a wireless telecommunication network that provides location and status information to requesting subscriber wherein the subscriber's request message is in email (see abstract; fig. 5; page 1, col. 2, paragraph (0008); claims 2 and 19). It is well known that an email uniquely defines an address in a manner a telephone number does. In other words, an address that has been assigned an email is pre-defined. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yehezkel's wireless data terminal with the teaching of Smith for the advantage of avoiding long

distance call fee when the location in question is outside the serving area (see page 1, col. 1, paragraphs (0004-0005).

Second, Yehezkel discloses "method and apparatus for providing location-based information services" to a mobile data terminal, connected directly to TELETRAC transceiver or by suing PDA or a portable computer with a wireless interface device to access other networks, upon request (see for e.g. col. 6, lines 53-67). In other words, Yehezkel provides a computer with a wireless interface device --- a mobile data terminal. In the final analysis, the difference between the claims and the Yehezkel's reference is the lack of explicit showing that the location request message is an email message. However, in a related field of endeavor, Holland teaches that a subscriber user of a subscriber computer can request position data information by accessing a web browser software and contacting the web server software residing in a remote location wherein the the subscriber computer could be a laptop or PDA (see col. 9, lines 19-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yehezkel's mobile data terminal (PDA or portable computer) with email capability of Holland's subscriber computer (data terminal) for the advantage of accessing the larger network of the internet (see col. 4, lines 18-48). In regard to Claims 2, 19 and 32, Ben-Yehezkel further discloses the method verifying a user of the wireless device prior to retrieving location-based information to said wireless device (C8, L.30-39).

In regard to Claim 3, Ben-Yehezkel also discloses the method of verifying in which it comprises determining whether the user of said wireless device is listed in a user database (C8, L.9-24).

In regard to Claims 4 and 34, Ben-Yehezkel further discloses that said location-based information comprises a location of at least one entity within a region containing of said wireless device (C7, L.63-67)(C8, L.12-14).

In regard to Claims 5 and 43, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the method of claim 4 wherein said location-based information comprises the location of at least one of gas stations, hotels, cinema, automobile repair facilities, department stores and emergency services (C7, L.67)(C8, L.1-5).

In regard to Claim 7, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the method of claim 1 wherein said determining of the received message comprises: identifying whether the received message contains a predefined character string; and determining the received message as a request for location-based information if the pre-defined character string is identified in the received message (C2, L.43-65).

In regard to Claim 8, Ben-Yehezkel discloses that the pre-defined character string is located in at least one of a header, a TO: field, a CC: field, or a body of the received message. Wherein the examiner interprets the usage of the term “information content” to be equivalent to the term of “body of the received message”.

In regard to Claim 9, Ben-Yehezkel also discloses that the pre-defined character string is in one of a text format and a binary format (C5, L.51-56)(Fig. 2, item 155).

In regard to Claim 10, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the determining of the received message is automatically identified as a request for location-based information (C4, L6-9).

In regard to Claim 11, Ben-Yehezkel further discloses that determining the location comprises: obtaining the location of said wireless device as determined by a wireless communications system of said wireless network (Fig. 2, item 128)(C5, L.14-26).

In regard to Claims 13 and 27, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the method of determining the location comprises: determining the location using at least one of time of arrival information, field strength values and global positioning system information. Wherein the geocoder referenced

by Ben-Yehezkel reflects the claimed global positioning system information in terms of latitude and longitude (C5, L.59-67)(C6, L.1-2).

In regard to Claims 18 and 35, Ben-Yehezkel discloses in his system that a received message is provided from at least one of a wireless network (C2, L.60-67)(C3, L.1-5). When the references are combined as shown above, the wireless network will be connected to the internet.

In regard to Claims 20 and 33, Ben-Yehezkel discloses in his method and apparatus that the location-based information comprises a map of the location of said wireless device retrieved via the CPU or the processor of the system (C5, L.57_67)(C6, L.1-28)(Fig. 2, items 150, 160 and 164).

In regard to Claim 25, Ben-Yehezkel discloses a method wherein determining the location comprises: transmitting a query signal to said wireless device, where said query signal causes said wireless device to respond with a response signal; and receiving said response signal from said wireless device, where said response signal is configured to include the location of said wireless device (C2, L.43-67)(C3, L.1-5)(C4, L6-9) (Fig.1, items 134 and 128)(C5, L.14-26).

In regard to Claims 36 and 37, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the apparatus to configure a replay or a forward message containing location-based information retrieved from a map database and a data retrieval system (C2, L.37-65)(Fig. 2)(C10, L.11-24, L.34-41).

In regard to Claim 38, Ben-Yehezkel discloses in his system that a wireless device comprises at least one of a two-way pager, a personal digital assistant (PDA) and a cellular telephone (Fig. 1, items 118, 124).

In regard to Claim 39, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the apparatus' processor to be able to utilize a digital data interface such as the Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP)

interface. Wherein the examiner acknowledges the TCP/IP interface to be one of data interface (C6, L.53-67)

In regard to Claim 40, Ben-Yehezkel discloses a wireless communications system controller, coupled to said support circuit, for determining the location of said wireless device (C5, L.37-43).

In regard to Claim 41, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the apparatus to include a request message to be from a wireless device (C2, L.43-46)(C4, L.59-64)(Fig. 1, 118 or 122 or 124).

In regard to Claim 42, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the request message is sent from a message sending device to request a map containing the location of wireless device (C2, L. 43-65)(4, L.38-33).

In regard to Claim 44, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the location-base information comprises a map of an area surrounding the wireless device (C.5, L.57-67)(C6, L.1-27).

In regard to Claim 22, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the method of claim 1 wherein said determining of the received message comprises: identifying whether the received message contains a predefined character string; and determining the received message as a request for location-based information if the pre-defined character string is identified in the received message (C2, L.43-65).

In regard to Claim 23, Ben-Yehezkel further discloses that the pre-defined character string is located in at least one of a header, a TO: field, a CC: field, or a body of the received message. Wherein the examiner interprets the usage of the term "information content" to be equivalent to the term of "body of the received message".

In regard to Claim 24, Ben-Yehezkel also discloses that the pre-defined character string is in one of a text format and a binary format (C5, L.51-56)(Fig. 2, item 155).

3. Claims 12 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Yehezkel in view Smith as applied above and further in view of Fattouche (Patent #5,890,068).

In regard to Claims 12 and 26 Ben-Yehezkel discloses a general method of location determination (C2, L.8-65). However, Ben-Yehezkel in view of Smith do not disclose explicitly that the method comprises of determining the location of a communications tower previously receiving a wireless signal from said wireless device. Fattouch teaches in his modified system to include measuring location by allowing a location acquisition station (or a communication tower) to receive radio signals to obtain arrival estimation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to follow Fattouche on Ben-Yehezkel in view of Smith in order to provide a better signal determination.

4. Claims 14-16 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Yehezkel in view Smith as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Kennedy (Patent #5,317,323).

In regard to Claims 14 and 28, Ben-Yehezkel discloses the method of determining the location comprises: determining the location of communications towers previously receiving a wireless signal from said wireless device (Abstract)(C2, L.43-65). However, Ben-Yehezkel in view of Smith do not specify that such calculation would be of at least two towers. The references also do not disclose explicitly that calculating the location of said wireless device from the locations of the least two communications towers. Kennedy explicitly teaches in his system the method of location calculation utilizing at least two radios or communication towers (C3, L.15-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to follow Kennedy on Ben-Yehezkel in view of Smith in order to provide a better accuracy.

In regard to Claims 15, 16, 29 and 30, Kennedy further teaches that the calculating comprises: averaging the location of the at least two communications towers and determining the maximum likelihood. Wherein the examiner interprets the process of averaging is a form of calculation (C3, L.8-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to follow Kennedy on Ben-Yehezkel in view of Smith in order to provide a better location determination.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-20 and 22-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meless N Zewdu whose telephone number is (703) 306-5418. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on (703) 308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Meless Zewdu

M. Z.

Examiner

20 May 2004.

W.T.
WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600